

EXHIBIT 1

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

3 RIVER CITY MEDIA, LLC, a)
4 Wyoming limited liability)
company, MARK FERRIS, an) NO. 1:17-CV-105-SAB
5 individual, MATT FERRIS, an)
individual, and AMBER PAUL,)
6 an individual,)
7 Plaintiffs,)
8 -vs-)
9 KROMTECH ALLIANCE CORPORATION,)
a German corporation, CHRIS)
10 VICKERY, an individual, CXO)
MEDIA, a Massachusetts)
11 corporation, INTERNATIONAL DATA)
GROUP, a Massachusetts)
12 corporation, and STEVE RAGAN,)
an individual, and DOES 1-50,)
13 Defendants.) August 16, 2017
14 Yakima, Washington

15
16 VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
17 MOTION HEARING

18 BEFORE THE HONORABLE STANLEY A. BASTIAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

19 APPEARANCES:

20 FOR PLAINTIFFS RIVER CITY
MEDIA, MATT FERRIS, MARK
21 FERRIS AND AMBER PAUL:

LEEOR NETA
Attorney at Law
600 California St., Floor 11
San Francisco, CA 94109

22
23
24
25 JAKE BERNSTEIN
Attorney at Law
2101 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1500
Seattle, WA 98121

1 FOR DEFENDANT KROMTECH
2 ALLIANCE CORPORATION:

MATTHEW BROWN
CHRISTOPHER B. DURBIN
AMY McCOWAN SMITH
Attorneys at Law
101 California Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

5 FOR DEFENDANT CXO MEDIA
6 AND INTERNATIONAL DATA
7 GROUP AND STEVE RAGAN:

CHARLES L. BABCOCK
WILLIAM J. STOWE
Attorneys at Law
1401 McKinney Street, Suite 1900
Houston, TX 77010

9
10
11 FOR DEFENDANT CHRIS
12 VICKERY: (Telephonically)

13 AARON V. ROCKE
14 Attorney at Law
101 Yesler Way, Suite 603
Seattle, WA 98104

15 REPORTED BY:

16 Lynette Walters, RPR, CRR, CCR
17 Official Court Reporter
18 P. O. Box 845
19 Yakima, WA 98907
(509) 573-6613

20 Proceedings reported by mechanical stenography; transcript
21 produced by computer-aided transcription.

22

23

24

25

1 I N D E X2 Page

3 Defendant IDG's Motion to Dismiss

4 Defendant CXO Media's and Steve Ragan's
5 Motion to Dismiss

6 Defendant Kromtech's Motion to Dismiss

7 Argument by Mr. Babcock	4
8 Argument by Mr. Stowe	11
9 Argument by Mr. Brown	17
10 Argument by Mr. Neta	26
11 Argument by Mr. Babcock	40
12 Argument by Mr. Brown	44
13 Argument by Mr. Neta	48

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 said, at first blush when we looked at the contract, we thought
2 there might be contradictory provisions. But the court dug into
3 the contract, interpreted it, and held as a matter of law that
4 there was no agency, no right to control the details of the work
5 there.

6 So in that same way, there's really no reason that it
7 can't be dealt with as a matter of law. And we don't need to
8 get into discovery, and then all the way through to the motion
9 for summary judgment, only to litigate the issue of whether
10 there's sufficient agency showing to hale Kromtech into court in
11 Washington.

12 THE COURT: Okay. You're at your five minutes. If
13 you want to wrap up, you may.

14 MR. BROWN: I am wrapping up. Thank you.

15 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Brown.

16 Mr. Neta.

17 MR. NETA: Very brief, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: I typically don't do this. Let me
19 explain. I'll give you two minutes. It is not your motion, but
20 it is your burden. So I think, since you're facing six against
21 two, I'll give you two minutes to sum it up.

22 MR. BABCOCK: Fair fight, Your Honor.

23 MR. NETA: Thank you. I'll keep it very brief.

24 The Washington statute that was referenced earlier, I
25 believe it's discretionary, and I don't think it has any impact

1 on federal courts. While it might be true that the Supreme
2 Court has tightened up general jurisdiction, I don't believe
3 that's the case with specific. And it's certainly not the case
4 of Internet actions.

5 A lot has been discussed about the *Walden* case, but I
6 just want to quickly bring your attention --

7 THE COURT: And you're proceeding only under specific
8 jurisdiction --

9 MR. NETA: That's correct, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: -- for all of the defendants, is my
11 impression, after reading all the briefing.

12 MR. NETA: Precisely. If you look at Footnote 9 of
13 the *Walden* case, it says specifically:

14 ... this case does not present the very
15 different question whether and how
16 defendant's virtual "presence" and conduct
17 translate into "contacts" with a particular
18 State. ... We leave questions about virtual
19 contacts for another day.

20 So while that case did have something to say about
21 constraining specific jurisdiction, it doesn't have any impact
22 on this case, because that's not what this case is about. It's
23 about Internet damage, Internet advertising commerce.

24 Quickly, on the issue of agency, I think there's
25 enough evidence in the case so far to indicate that Kromtech had
some agency control over Mr. Vickery. And as I said earlier,
CXO doesn't really dispute the notion that they had agency

1 control over Mr. Ragan. There is a question about CXO and IDG
2 and to the extent to which they're interrelated, but all I would
3 say in response to that, Your Honor, is if you feel that
4 question needs to be more appropriately addressed in the
5 pleadings, we're happy to take jurisdictional discovery on
6 certain questions so that we can resolve that issue.

7 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. NETA: Thank you, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: All right. I'll try to get a decision out
10 as soon as I can. I do have a week-long trial that begins on
11 Monday, so that will probably get in the way of this a little
12 bit, but we'll work on it, get it out as soon as we can. It
13 will be a couple weeks.

14 But I've enjoyed our time this afternoon. And thank
15 you for being prepared, organized, and efficient.

16 MR. NETA: Thank you.

17 MR. BABCOCK: Thank you, Your Honor,

18 (ADJOURNMENT at 2:39 P.M.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3

4

5 I, LYNETTE WALTERS, Registered Professional Reporter,
6 Certified Realtime Reporter and Certified Court Reporter;

7 DO HEREBY CERTIFY:

8 That the foregoing transcript, Pages 1 through 50,
9 contains a full, true, complete and accurate transcription of my
10 shorthand notes of all requested matters held in the foregoing
11 captioned case, including all objections and exceptions made by
12 counsel, rulings by the court, and any and all other matters
13 relevant to this case.

14 DATED this 12th day of September, 2017

15

16

17

s/ Lynette Walters

18

LYNETTE WALTERS, RPR, CRR, CCR
CCR NO. 2230

19

20

21

22

23

24

25